A Complete Solution to the Problem of Decomposing a Representation Into Irreducible Representations and its Applications to the Solutions of Three Great Problems in C*-Algebras

Shamim I. Ansari

arXiv:1212.6192v1 [math.OA] 26 Dec 2012

In this paper we give a decomposition of a state on a C^*-algebra into a family of pure states and a decomposition of a representation into a family of irreducible representations. Then, we use it to solve the following three problems and/or conjectures. (1) The noncommutative Stone-Weierstrass problem, (2) The extension problem (asked by Arveson) of a pure state on a nonseparable operator system to a boundary state on the generated C^*-algebra, and (3) The hyperrigidity problem of an operator system under the hypothesis that pure states have the unique extension property, conjectured by Arveson.

Introduction. (1) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*-algebra with identity I and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \to B(H)$ be a representation of $\mathcal{A}$. It has been desirable to decompose π into a direct sum of irreducible reprs. This amounts to writing the identity I as a sum of mutually orthogonal minimal projections in the commutant $\pi[\mathcal{A}]'$ of $\pi[\mathcal{A}]$. But, it is well known that it can be done for some, but not for all reprs. The disintegration theory given by J. Dixmier [14] solves this problem by presenting not a direct sum, but a direct integral in case $\mathcal{A}$ is separable. In this article we give a decomposition applicable even if $\mathcal{A}$ is not separable. Then, we apply our decomposition to obtain solutions to the three problems mentioned above.

(2) Let $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ be two C^*-algebras with $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and $P(\mathcal{A})$ = the set of all pure states of $\mathcal{A} \cup \{0\}$. Suppose $\mathcal{B}$ separates points of $P(\mathcal{A})$. The non commutative Stone-Weierstrass problem asks the question : Is $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$? In this paper we shall answer this question in the affirmative. This very beautiful and very important theorem, the Stone-Weierstrass theorem for C^*-algebras has evolved from commutative version to noncommutative over longer than half

a century by several great mathematicians. Its development until 1982 is well given in [Akemann-Anderson,5]. In earlier years the theorem was proved under special cases. I. Kaplanksy [22] was the first to boldly conjecture that the theorem holds in this generality. After (1957) R. V. Kadison's result [20] concerning the one-one correspondence between maximal modular left ideals and pure states, the conjecture seemed more likely to be true. See Also the (1970) work of Akemann [4] in this conection. Some other results of Kadison have also been very useful in the development of the theory. S. Sakai's work have also been greatly useful in this area of research. It has also been thought by some authors that the conjecture holds if the smaller algebra separates factorial states of the bigger one. J. Anderson and J. Bunce proved [7, 1981] that if the algebras are separable and each factor state of the smaller one extends to a factor state of the bigger one, then the SWT holds under the hypothesis that the smaller algebra separates the factor states of the bigger one. S. Sakai and Tsui's [40] work gives such extension in some cases. See S. Sakai [39] and Tsui [44,45] for more on this topic. R. Longo and S. Popa solved this problem completely and independently in the affirmative using the deep theory of factors in separable case. This has been a celebrated result in the theory of SWT. M. Tomita [43, 1959] introduced regularity of projections and [16,1963] E. G. Effros developed this topic and the theory of order ideals in relation to the SWT. C. A. Akemann defined open and closed projections [3,1969] and proved several very useful results concerning closed and open projections and order ideals. Finally, he proved [3,1969] that if z is the supremum of all the minimal projections in A^{**}, then $z\mathcal{A}^{**} = z\mathcal{B}^{**}$. We use this very important result in our proof. We use also a variant of a result of J. Glimm [18,1960] given by Akemann in [3,1969] and a part of the definition of a dilation given by Effros in [17,1972]. The back ground we have presented here is highly incomplete. The complete list of papers making contributions in this area is huge and we cannot possibly include it here.

(3) W. B. Arveson [9,10,11] did an extensive very important work on boundary states and Choquet boundary of a noncommutative

C^*-algebras. In [10, Thm. 8.2] using disintegration theory, Arveson proved that if $\mathcal{S}$ is a separable operator system, $C^*(\mathcal{S})$ is the C^*-algebra generated by $\mathcal{S}$, $f_0 : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{C}$ is any pure state, then there exists a pure state extension f on $C^*(\mathcal{S})$ of f_0 such that the GNS representation $\pi_f : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ is the boundary repr, that is it has the unique extension property in the sense that if $\phi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ is any unital completely positive (ucp) map such that $\phi(s) = \pi_f(s)\ \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$, then then $\phi(A) = \pi_f(A)\ \forall A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$. As stated in the abstract, he asked the question if this result holds for all nonseparable operator systems as well. In this paper we answer this problem in the affirmative.

In the same paper [10] he proved also that (Theorem 7.1) every separable operator system has "sufficiently many" boundary representations and has made a remark that his Theorem 8.2 contains Theorem 7.1.

In Section 9 of [10] he asks a question that he calls a "test problem". The question is: Does his Theorem 7.1 remain true if separability condition is removed? As the generalization of Theorem 8.2 (i.e. the result for nonseparable case) implies the generalization of Theorem 7.1, our answer contains the answer to this test problem as well. We feel that or our method of going from a state to pure states (linked to the state) by decomposing and taking limits and then coming back to the state from the pure states using Krein-Milman [26] theorem, will be applicable in several new situations. On pg 1083 of [10] he writes concerning getting rid of separability hypothesis from Theorem 7.1, *Perhaps it is worth pointing out that in general, heroic attempts to get rid of separability hypothesis for problems in operator algebras can force one to look at the fundamentals of set theory.* Then he gives as an example, a very famous counterexample of Akemann and Weaver [8] to the long posed famous Naimark problem, where the authors showed that the statement *There is a counterexample to Naimark problem that is generated by $\aleph_1$ elements is undecidable within set theory.* We are pleased that we didn't have to get into un decidability. We very much regret that Arveson is not among us today.

We refer our readers to the papers of J. Agler [1], W. B. Arveson

[9,10,11], D. Blecher [12], M. Dritschel and S. McCullough [15], C. Kleski[25], Korovkin [27], P. Muhly and B. Solel [13], M. Hamana [19], V. B. Limaye and M. N. N. Namboodiri [28], and the monograph of V. Paulsen [33] and the references there in, W. M. Priestley [37], S.-E. Takehasi [42], and Jun Ichi Fujii [23], for a more detailed background of the subject and for the contributions of these authors.

(4) In [9] Arveson defined hyperrigidity (HR) of a separable operator system and gave a characterization of it. Then he proved HR of some separable operator system under the hypothesis that all irreducible reprs of it are boundary reprs. Next, he made a [Conjecture 4.3,9] that any separable operator system is hyperrigid iff all its irred reprs are boundary reprs. The definition of HR extends from separable to non-separable operator systems without any effort. In this paper we prove his conjecture for not only separable operator systems, but for all.

Section 1. A Decomposition of A Representation Into Irreducible Representations

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*-algebra with identity I. Let $\pi : \mathcal{A} \to B(H)$ be the GNS repr. Then $\pi(I)$ is the identity of the C^*-algebra $\overline{\pi[\mathcal{A}]}^{\|\cdot\|}$. We will decompose $\pi(I)$ into a set of mutually orthogonal minimal projections that are not necessarily members of $B(H)$. The exact place of these projections is well described in the construction of the decomposition. As in case of disintegration theory the original repr. is an integral of all the decomposed irred ones, in our case the original repr is a weak star limit of convex combinations of the decomposed irred ones. We leave it to our readers to find similarities between irred repr appearing in disintegration theory and in our decomposition.

Notation.

The words "representation" and "representations" are often written as "repr." Whenever h is a state on $\mathcal{A}$, its GNS repr. is denoted

π_h. The left ideal appearing in the construction is denoted $L(h)$. The pre-Hilbert space $\{A + L(h) : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is denoted V_h and its completion under the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is represented by H_h. The element $\pi_h(I) + L(h) \in V_h$ is simply written as either 1, or 1_h, or $1 + L(h)$. If $A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$, we shall often write $A \in H_h$ instead of $\pi_h(A) \in H_h$. If $A+L(h), B+L(h) \in H_h$, then $(A+L(h), B+L(h))$ will be written as (A, B) or $(A, B)_h$.

Process I. In this process and the next we decompose a state into two ortho. states and a repr. into two ortho. reprs. We do this infinitely many times. Let h be any state on $\mathcal{A}$ and $\pi_h : \mathcal{A} \to B(H_h)$ be the GNS repr defined by h. Let $b \in \mathcal{A}$ be any selfadjoint arbitrarily chosen element. We assume that h is not a pure state. So, there exists a vector $x_0 \in H_h$ which is noncyclic for $\pi_h[\mathcal{A}]$. Let $H_0 = \operatorname{cl}\{\pi_h A x_0 : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Then, $H_0^\perp$ is also invariant under $\pi_h[\mathcal{A}]$. Let $P_0 : H \to H_0$ be the orth. proj. onto H_0. $1 = I + L(h) \in H_h$ be the cyclic vector. Let $1_0 = P_0 1/\|P_0 1\|$, $1_0^\perp = P_0^\perp 1/\|P_0^\perp 1\|$. Let $Q_0 = P_0$. Let $t_0 = \|P_0 1\|^2$. Then $(1 - t_0) = \|P_0^\perp 1\|^2$. Note that, $P_0(\pi_h A) = (\pi_h A)P_0$ $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}$. So, $Q_0, P_0 \in (\pi_h[\mathcal{A}])' \subseteq B(H_h)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} h(A) &= (\pi_h(A)1, 1) \\ &= t_0(\pi_h(A)1_0, 1_0) + (1 - t_0)(\pi_h(A)1_0^\perp, 1_0^\perp) \\ &= t_0(P_0\pi_h(A)P_0 1_0, 1_0) + (1 - t_0)(P_0^\perp\pi_h(A)P_0^\perp 1_0^\perp, 1_0^\perp). \end{aligned}$$

Define the following four items.

(1) $\pi_0(A) = P_0\pi(A)P_0 \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.
(2) $h_0(A) = (\pi_h(A)1_0, 1_0) \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.
(3) $h_0^\perp(A) = (\pi_h(A)1_0^\perp, 1_0^\perp) \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.
(4) $S_0(h) = \{h_0\}$.
(5) and $S_0(h)^\perp = \{h_0^\perp\}$.

Since, $t_0 h_0(b) + (1-t_0)h_0^\perp(b) = h(b)$, either $h_0(b) \geq h(b)$ or $h_0^\perp(b) \geq h(b)$. If $h_0^\perp(b) \geq h(b)$, interchange the names of h_0 and $h_0^\perp$. Then, $h_0(b) \geq h(b)$. If we do have to interchange their names, then we need to do the same to the names of H_0 and $H_0^\perp$, P_0 and $P_0^\perp$, Q_0 and $Q_0^\perp$, and π_0 and $\pi_0^\perp$. Now suppose $h_n, H_n, \pi_n, P_n : H_{n-1} \to$

$H_n, 1_n$ and $Q_n : H_h \to H_n$, $Q_n = P_n P_{n-1} \cdots P_0$ have been defined for $n \leq m-1$. We can assume without loss of generality that $h_n(b) \geq h_{n-1}(b) \geq h(b)$. Suppose that h_{m-1} is not pure. Then there exists $x_m \in H_{m-1}$, a noncyclic vector for $\pi_{m-1}[\mathcal{A}]$. Let $H_m = \text{ cl}\{\pi_{m-1} A x_m : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and $H_m^\perp$ be the orth. complement of H_m in H_{m-1}. Then, $H_m^\perp$ is also invariant under $\pi_{m-1}[\mathcal{A}]$. Let $P_m : H_{m-1} \to H_m$ and $P_m^\perp : H_{(m-1)} \to H_m^\perp$ be the orth projs onto H_m and $H_m^\perp$, resp. Let $Q_m = P_m P_{m-1} \cdot P_0$. Let $1_m = P_m 1_{m-1}/\|P_m 1_{m-1}\|$, $1_m^\perp = P_m^\perp 1_{m-1}/\|P_m^\perp 1_{m-1}\|$ and $t_m = \|P_m 1_{m-1}\|^2$. Then, $(1-t_m) = \|P_m^\perp 1_{m-1}\|^2$. Then, $P_m(\pi_{(m-1)}A) = (\pi_{(m-1)}A)P_m$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h_{m-1}(A) &= (\pi_{(m-1)}(A)1_{m-1}, 1_{m-1}) \\ &= t_m(\pi_{m-1}(A)1_m, 1_m) + (1-t_m)(\pi_{m-1}(A)1_m^\perp, 1_m^\perp) \\ &= t_m(P_m \pi_{m-1}(A) P_m 1_m, 1_m) + \\ &\quad (1-t_m)(P_m \pi_{m-1}(A) P_m 1_m^\perp, 1_m^\perp). \end{aligned}$$

Define the following five items.

(1) $\pi_m(A) = P_m \pi_{m-1}(A) P_m \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.
(2) $h_m(A) = (\pi_m(A)1_m, 1_m) \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.
(3) $h_m^\perp(A) = (\pi_m(A)1_m^\perp, 1_m^\perp) \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.
(4) $S_m(h) = \{h_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$.
(5) $S_m^\perp(h) = \{h_i^\perp : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$.

As in earlier cases we can assume that $h_m(b) \geq h_{m-1}(b) \geq h(b)$. Next, suppose $h_n, H_n, \pi_n, 1_n$ have been defined for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define P_ω as follows.

Case 1. $\cap_{m=1}^\infty H_m = \emptyset$.
Define H_ω as follows. Let $V_\omega = \{A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Then, V_ω is a vector space. Define $(A, B)_\omega = \lim (A, B)_{m\alpha}$ $\forall A, B \in V_\omega$. Then, $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is an inner product on V_ω. Let H_ω be the completion of V_ω w.r.t. this inner product. Now we have the space $B(H_\omega)$. For all $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$, define

$$(Q_\omega(A), B)_\omega = (Q_{m_\alpha}(A), B)_{m_\alpha},$$

$$\Big(\pi_\omega(A)B, C\Big)_\omega = \lim \Big(\pi_{m_\alpha}(A)B, C\Big)_{m_\alpha}.$$

By the density of V_ω in H_ω, Q_ω and π_ω are completely defined. Next, Define $h_\omega : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ as follows.

$$h_\omega(A) = \Big(\pi_\omega(A)1_\omega, 1_\omega\Big).$$

Since $h_n(b) \geq h_{n-1}(b) \geq h(b)$ $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, and each $m_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, by the definition $h_\omega(b) \geq h(b)$. Note that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$,

Case 2. $H_\omega = \cap_{m=1}^{\infty} H_m \neq \emptyset$.
Let $Q_\omega : H_h \to H_\omega$ be the onto orth proj. Define,
$1_\omega = Q_\omega 1/\|Q_\omega 1\|$, and

1. $\pi_\omega(A) = Q_\omega \pi_h(A) Q_\omega, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$,
2. $h_\omega(A) = (\pi_\omega(A)1_\omega, 1_\omega) = \lim\ (\pi_{m_\alpha}(A)1_{m_\alpha}, 1_{m_\alpha})$
   $= \lim\ h_{m_\alpha}(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Note that $h_\omega(b) = \lim\ (\pi_{m\alpha}(b)1_{m\alpha}, 1) = \lim\ h_{m\alpha}(b) \geq h(b)$.
Now suppose $h_\alpha, P_\alpha, Q_\alpha, \pi_a, S_\alpha, S_\alpha^\perp$ have been defined $\forall \alpha < \sigma$ such that (a) and (b) hold.
(a) For any nonlimit ordinal $\eta < \alpha$, there exists h_η and $h_\eta^\perp$ with $h_{\eta-1} = h_\eta \oplus h_\eta^\perp$, $H_{\eta-1} = H_\eta \oplus H_\eta^\perp$. $Q_\eta : H_h \to H_\eta$, $P_\eta : H_{\eta-1} \to H_\eta$ a proj. such that $Q_\eta = P_\eta \circ Q_{\eta-1}$ and $1_\eta = P_\eta 1_{\eta-1}/\|P_\eta 1_{\eta-1}\| = Q_\eta 1/\|Q_\eta 1\|$, $1_\eta^\perp = 1_\eta - 1_{\eta-1}$,

1. $\pi_\eta = P_\eta \pi_{\eta-1} P_\eta$.
2. $h_\eta(A) = (\pi_{h_\eta}(A)1_\eta, 1_\eta)$,
3. $h_\eta^\perp(A) = (\pi_\eta(A)1_\eta^\perp, 1_\eta^\perp)$,
4. $h_\eta(b) \geq h(b)$,

(b) For any limit ordinal $\eta < \alpha$, let $V_\eta = \{A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Then, V_η is a vector space. Let H_η be the completion of V_η, where the inner product on V_η is defined by $(A, B)_\eta = \lim\ (A, B)_{\gamma_\lambda}$, $\gamma_\lambda \to \eta$, and the limit exists for each $A, B \in V_\eta$. $1_\eta = I$, where $I \in \mathcal{A}$,

1. For $A \in V_h$, $Q_\eta(A) \in H_\eta$. For $B \in V_\eta$, $(Q_\eta(A), B)_\eta = \lim\ (Q_{\gamma_\lambda}(A), B)_{\gamma_\lambda}$.
2. $(\pi_\eta(A)B, C)_\eta = \lim(\pi_{\gamma_\lambda}(A)B, C)_{\gamma_\lambda} \quad \forall A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$.
3. $h_\eta(A) = \lim h_{\gamma_\lambda}(A) = \lim(\pi_{\gamma_\lambda}(A)1_{\gamma_\lambda}, 1_{\gamma_\lambda})$
   where the net (γ_λ) is such that (i) $\gamma_\lambda \to \eta$ and
   (ii) $\lim h_{\gamma_\lambda}(A)$ exists for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$.
4. $h_\eta(b) \geq h(b)$. exists for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Now if α is a limit ordinal there is a subnet (α_λ) of (α) such that $\lim h_{\alpha_\lambda}(A)$ exists for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Let h_α be defined by $h_\alpha(A) = \lim h_{\alpha_\lambda}(A)$. Define $V_\alpha, H_\alpha, Q_\alpha, h_\alpha, 1_\alpha, \pi_\alpha$ the obvious way now. Then, the conditions in (b) that hold for $V_\eta, \cdots, \pi_\eta$, hold for newly defined structures $V_\alpha, \cdots, \pi_\alpha$ as well.
Next if α is a nonlimit ordinal, then $h_{\alpha-1}$ has been defined and $h_{\alpha-1} = h_\alpha \oplus h_\alpha^\perp$ for some h_α and $h_\alpha^\perp$. This defines h_α. Defined $V_\alpha, H_\alpha, Q_\alpha, h_\alpha, 1_\alpha, \pi_\alpha$ so that the conditions in (a) that hold for $V_\eta, \cdots, \pi_\eta$, hold also $V_\alpha, \cdots, \pi_\alpha$. Since, for any nonlimit ordinal $\gamma < \alpha$, wlg we can assume that $h_\gamma(b) \geq h(b)$. If γ is a limit ordinal from the definition of h_γ it follows that $h_\gamma(b) \geq h(b)$.
Claim. h_{λ_0} is pure for some ordinal λ_0 and $h_{\lambda_0}(b) \geq h(b)$.
Proof. Clearly $h_\mu \neq h_\eta$ if $\mu \neq \eta$. Also, the cardinality of the state space of $\mathcal{A}$ is less than λ_0 for some ordinal λ_0. So, the process has to stop. Clearly, it stops when h_{λ_0} is pure. The second part of the claim is clear. Set $\lambda_0 = \lambda_b$.

What we have completed so far is a process beginning at h and ending at a pure state h_{λ_b} such that $h_{\lambda_b}(b) \geq h(b)$.

Process II. Now let $c \in \mathcal{A}$ be any selfadjoint element with $c \neq b$. In Process I we have defined a chain of states h_η leading to a pure state h_{λ_b} such that $h_{\lambda_b} \geq h(b)$ There is the first ordinal γ_0 such that $h_{\gamma 0}(c) < h(c)$.
Claim. γ_0 is a nonlimit ordinal.
Proof. Suppose not, then for all $\eta < \gamma_0$, $h_\eta(c) \geq h(c)$. $h_{\gamma 0}(c) = \lim h_\eta(c) \geq h(c)$. Contradiction. This proves the claim.
By the claim $\gamma_0 - 1$ exists and $h_{\gamma_0 - 1} = t h_{\gamma_0} + (1-t) h_{\gamma_0}^\perp$ where $t, (1-t) \geq 0$. By the choice of γ_0, $h_{\gamma_0 - 1}(c) \geq h(c)$. So, $h_{\gamma_0}^\perp(c) \geq h(c)$. Continuing at $h_{\gamma_0}^\perp$ we can define a chain of states k_η leading to a pure state k_{λ_c} such that $k_{\lambda_c}(c) \geq h(c)$. Set

(1) $\mathcal{P} = \Big\{ h_{\lambda_b} : h_{\lambda_b} \text{ is a pure state obtained in Process II} \Big\}$,
(2) $\tilde{\sigma} = \Big\{ \sigma : \sigma = \lambda_b \text{ for some } b \in \mathcal{A} \Big\}$.

Since, for every selfadjoint element $b \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists an element $h_{\lambda_b} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $h_{\lambda_b}(b) = h(b)$, h cannot be separated from the w^*-closed convex span of $\mathcal{P}$ by any selfadjoint element of $\mathcal{A}$. Hence, they cannot be separated by any element of $\mathcal{A}$. So, by the Hahn-Banach theorem $h \in$ cl conv $\mathcal{P}$. Hence, by the famous Krein-Milman theorem [26] H is a w^*-limit of convex combinations of extreme points of cl conv $\mathcal{P}$. By Milman's converse [30] to the Krein-Milman theorem, every extreme point of cl conv $\mathcal{P}$ belongs to the w^*-closure of $\mathcal{P}$. Every limit point of $\mathcal{P}$ is a w^*-limit of a net of elements from $\mathcal{P}$. So, it follows that there is a net (η_α) of finite subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ such that $\phi_{n_\alpha}(A) \to h(A)\ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$, where

$$\text{(I)} \quad \phi_{n_\alpha} = \sum_{\sigma \in n_\alpha} t_\sigma h_\sigma, \qquad t_\sigma \geq 0, \qquad \sum_{\sigma \in n_\alpha} t_\sigma = 1, \qquad h_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Remark. Note that each $h_\sigma = h_{\lambda_b}$ for some $b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $h_{\lambda_b}(b) \geq h(b)$. We will not make use of this property here. However, it could have applications elsewhere.

Recall that $\oplus H_\sigma = \{(x_\sigma)_\sigma : \sum_\sigma \|x_\sigma\|^2 < \infty\}$ and that $\oplus B(H_\sigma) = \{(R_\sigma) : R_\sigma \in B(H_\sigma), \ \ \sup \|R_\sigma\| < \infty\}$.

Definition 1.1. Let $(R_\sigma)_\sigma \in \oplus_\sigma B(H_\sigma)$ such that $\|R_\sigma\|_\sigma \leq 1\ \forall \sigma$. Define $J_1 : \oplus B(H_\sigma) \to B(H_h)$ by $J_1(R_\sigma)_\sigma = R$, where $R \in B(H_h)$ is defined by

$$\Big(R(A), B\Big)_h = \lim\nolimits_{\eta_\alpha} \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \Big(R_\sigma A, B\Big)_\sigma$$

for all $A, B \in V_h$. To see that R is bounded and linear on V_h, suppose $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, and $A, B \in H_h$. $\|A\|_h \leq 1, \|B\|_h \leq 1$. We have $|(R_\sigma A, B)_\sigma| \leq 1\ \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{P}$. So, $|(R_\sigma A, B)_h| \leq 1$. That is, $\|R\| \leq 1$. It is routine to check that $\big(R(A_1 + A_2), B\big)_h = \big(RA_1, B\big)_h + \big(RA_2, B\big)_h$. Hence, R is bounded and linear on V_h. So, it extends uniquely to an element of $B(H_h)$.

Definition 1.2. We are going to define something we shall call "thin closure of $\pi(\mathcal{A})$" we shall repr it as $\overline{\pi(\mathcal{A})}^{\text{thin}}$. So choose any $R \in B(H_h)$. In the process of going from h to h_σ we get a chain

$(R_{\sigma,\alpha})$ with $R_{\sigma,\alpha} \in B(H_{\sigma,\alpha})$ arising from R. If $R_{\sigma,\alpha} \in \{\pi_{\sigma,\alpha}(A)\}''$ for each α with $1 \leq \alpha \leq \sigma$, and for each $\sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}$, then $R \in \overline{\pi(A)}^{\text{thin}}$.

Definition of R_α's. Let us fix a $\sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}$. We will be going from h to h_σ. For simplicity of notation, for $R_{\sigma,\alpha}$ and $H_{\sigma,\alpha}$ we will be writing only R_α and H_α. (1) We have defined repr $\pi_n : \mathcal{A} \to B(H_n)$. The spaces H_n are subspace of H_h. $R_n = Q_n R|_{H_n}$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $Q_n : H_h \to H_n$ is the orth. proj. Suppose $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n = \emptyset$. Let H_ω be as defined earlier. Define $R_\omega : H_\omega \to H_\omega$ as follows. If $A \in V_\omega$, $R_\omega(A) \in H_\omega$ is that element of H_ω whose value at B, for any $B \in V_\omega$ is given by

$$\Big(R_\omega(A), B\Big)_\omega = \lim \Big(R_{m_\alpha}(A), B\Big)_{m_\alpha},$$

where (m_α) is such that the limit exists for each $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$.
Now suppose $H_\omega = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n \neq \emptyset$. In this case define $R_\omega = Q_\omega R|_{H_\omega}$, where $Q_\omega : H_h \to H_\omega$ is an orth. proj.
(2) Now suppose γ is a limit ordinal and $R_\alpha \in B(H_\alpha)$ has been defined $\forall \alpha < \gamma$. Define R_γ to be that element of $B(H_\gamma)$ whose value at $A \in V_\gamma$ is the vector $R_\gamma(A)$, whose value at any element $B \in V_\gamma$ is given by

$$\Big(R_\gamma(A), B\Big)_\gamma = \lim \Big(R_{\alpha_\lambda}(A), B\Big)_{\alpha_\lambda},$$

where $\alpha_\lambda \to \gamma$ is a subnet such that the above limit exists for each $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$. By the density of V_γ in H_γ, R_γ can be uniquely extended to be element of $B(H_\gamma)$.
(4) Suppose γ is a nonlimit ordinal. So, $\gamma - 1$ exists. $H_{\gamma-1} = H_\gamma \oplus H_\gamma^\perp$. Define, $R_\gamma = P_\gamma^{\gamma-1} R_{\gamma-1}|_{H_\gamma}$, where $P_\gamma^{\gamma-1} : H_{\gamma-1} \to H_\gamma$ is the orth proj. (5) Finally, the process stops at $\alpha = \lambda_b$. At this step we get $R_\sigma \in B(H_\sigma)$.

Definition 1.3. Let $J_2 : B(H_h) \to \oplus B(H_\sigma)$ be the mapping defined by $J_2(R) = (R_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}}$.

Lemma 1.1. If $R \in \overline{\pi(\mathcal{A})}^{\text{thin}}$, then $R = J_1 J_2 R$.

Poof. This is easy and left to the readers.

Notation. For any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\pi(A) \in \pi(\mathcal{A})$. Define $\tilde{h} : \pi(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\tilde{h}(\pi(A)) = h(A).$$

Remark 1. (a) Since, h_σ is a pure state, $\tilde{h}_\sigma$ is a pure state for each $\sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}$. (b) Since, π_σ is an irreducible repr, $\pi_\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ is (wot) dense in $B(H_\sigma)$. By the Kaplansky density theorem [14] (see [24]) the unit ball of $\pi_\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ is (wot) dense in the unit ball of $B(H_\sigma)$. So, given any element $R_\sigma \in B(H_\sigma)$, there is a net $(\pi(A_{\sigma\alpha})) \subseteq \pi_\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ converging to R_σ in the (wot) and $\|\pi(A_{\sigma\alpha})\| \leq \|R_\sigma\|$ $\forall \alpha$. Since the net is bounded the convergence of $(\pi(A_{\sigma\alpha}))$ in the (wot) is equivalent to

$$(\pi(A_{\sigma\alpha})A, B)_\sigma \to (R_\sigma A, B)_\sigma \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{A},$$

which in turn is equivalent to

$$\tilde{h}_\sigma(B^*\pi(A_{\sigma\alpha})A) \to (R_\sigma A, B)_\sigma \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{A},$$

Define,

$$\tilde{h}_\sigma(R_\sigma) = \lim_\alpha \tilde{h}_\sigma(\pi(A_{\sigma\alpha})).$$

Theorem 1.1 (A).

Decomposition of a State into Pure States. For each state h on $\mathcal{A}$, we have defined a family $\{h_\sigma : \sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}\} = \{h_{\lambda_b} : b \in \mathcal{A}\}$ of pure states a net (η_α) of finite subsets of $\mathcal{P} = \tilde{\sigma}$, a net $(t_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha}$, a net $(h_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha}$ all satisfying Eqn I, such that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and for each $R \in \overline{\pi_h(A)}^{\text{thin}}$ we have,

$$\text{(II)} \qquad h(A) = \lim_\alpha \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma h_\sigma(A),$$

(III)

$$\overline{h}(R) = \lim_\alpha \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \overline{h}_\sigma(R) = \lim_\alpha \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \overline{h}_\sigma(R_\sigma).$$

Theorem 1.1 (B).
Decomposition of a Representation into Irreducible Representations. Note that all the representations π_α, appearing in the process of going from h to h_σ for each σ are GNS representations of the corresponding states h_α for $\alpha \leq \sigma$. With $\eta_\alpha, t_\sigma, \pi_\sigma \tilde{h}_\sigma$. we have $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\text{(IV)} \qquad \pi_h(A) = \lim_\alpha \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \pi_\sigma(A).$$

in the following sense. For all $B, C \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\text{(V)} \qquad \Big(\pi_h(A)B, C\Big)_h = \lim_\alpha \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \Big(\pi_\sigma(A)B, C\Big)_\sigma.$$

For all $R \in \overline{\pi_h(\mathcal{A})}^{\text{thin}}$,

$$\text{(VI)} \qquad R = \lim_\alpha \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma R_\sigma.$$

in the following sense. For all $B, C \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\text{(VII)} \qquad \Big(R(B), C\Big)_h = \lim_\alpha \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \Big(R_\sigma(B), C\Big)_\sigma.$$

Note that $R_\sigma \in (wot \cdot cl)\pi_\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = B(H_\sigma)$, since h_σ is a pure state. So, all the terms are well defined.

Section 2. The General Stone-Weierstrass Theorem For C^*-Algebras

Theorem 2.1. The Main Theorem. Let $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ be two C^*-algebras with $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and $P(\mathcal{A})$ = the set of all pure states of $\mathcal{A}$ $\cup\{0\}$. If $\mathcal{B}$ separates points of $P(\mathcal{A})$, then $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 1. In [3] Akemann has proved that without loss of generality we can assume that both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ contain their identities and $\mathcal{B}$ contains the identity of $\mathcal{A}$. We will assume this in the entire paper.

Notation1.

1. In this paper by *SWT* we shall mean the "Stone-Weierstrass theorem" Theorem 2.1.
2. The symbols, $S(\mathcal{B})$, $S(\mathcal{A})$, $P(\mathcal{B})$, and $P(\mathcal{A})$ stand for the state spaces of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, and for the sets of pure states of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, respectively. In the present situation we have $P(\mathcal{B}) = P(\mathcal{A})$.
3. If $h \in S(\mathcal{A})$, $\pi : \mathcal{A} \to B(H)$ is the GNS representation defined by h, and $U \in H$, then $Uh(B) = h(UB) = (B^*, U)$, where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the inner product defined on H.
4. By [Dixmier,14], there is a central projection in $\mathcal{A}^{**}$, which is the supremum of the minimal projections in $\mathcal{A}^{**}$. The letter "z" will stand for this projection.
5. Whenever f is a state on a C^*-algebra, the symbols "$L(f)$", "$H(f)$", or "H_f", or $H(f, \mathcal{A})$ stand respectively, for the left ideal associated with f, and the Hilbert space associated with f in its GNS construction.
6. The identity of $\mathcal{A}^{**}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{**}$ will be denoted by 1 and 1_0, respectively.

Lemma 2.1. For any $f \in S(\mathcal{A}) \setminus P(\mathcal{A})$ and $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$,
$h(UB) = h(VB) \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad h(UA) = h(VA) \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}.$
Proof. By Equation I and our Theorem1.1 (A) of Section 1, there is a net (η_α) of finite subsets of $\tilde{\sigma}$ such that

$$\phi_{\eta_\alpha} \to h, \quad \text{that is,} \quad \phi_{\eta_\alpha}(A) \to h(A) \ \forall A \in \mathcal{A},$$

where

$$\phi_{\eta_\alpha} = \sum_{\sigma \in \eta_\alpha} t_\sigma h_\sigma.$$

$h'_\sigma s$ are pure states, so by the discussion in paragraph 2 of [Akem 1], the functionals $(Uh_\sigma)|_{\mathcal{B}}, (Vh_\sigma)|_{\mathcal{B}} \in z\mathcal{B}^*$. So, finite sums of such functionals, $(U\phi_{\eta_\sigma})|_{\mathcal{B}}, (V\phi_{\eta_\sigma})|_{\mathcal{B}} \in zB^*$. where $U\phi_{\eta_\sigma}(A) = \phi_{\eta_\sigma}(UA)$ and $V\phi_{\eta_\sigma}(A) = \phi_{\eta_\sigma}(VA) \ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$. So, by [Lemma III.2,3] $(U\phi_{\eta_\sigma})|_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $(V\phi_{\eta_\sigma})|_{\mathcal{B}}$ have unique extensions. Since, $(U\phi_{\eta_\sigma})|_{\mathcal{B}} = (V\phi_{\eta_\sigma})|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and $U\phi_{\eta_\sigma}$ and $V\phi_{\eta_\sigma}$ are their respective extensions, the extensions are equal. That is, $U\phi_{\eta_\sigma} = V\phi_{\eta_\sigma}$ on $\mathcal{A}$. So,

$$\lim U\phi_{\eta_\alpha} = \lim V\phi_{\eta_\alpha}.$$

That is,

$$h(UA) = h(VA)\ \forall A \in \mathcal{A}. \qquad \square$$

Remark. According to Effros [17, 1972], a linear transformation from the state space of a smaller function system to the state space of the bigger function system is called a "Dilation". In what follows we define a particular linear transformation from only a part of the state space of $\mathcal{B}$ to the state space of $\mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 2.2. For any $h \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and any element $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$, there is a bounded net (B_α) in $\mathcal{B}$ such that $(X, B_\alpha)_h \to (X, A_0)_h$ for all $X \in H(h, \mathcal{A})$, where $(\cdot,\cdot)_h$ is the inner product on the Hilbert space $H(h, \mathcal{A})$ appearing in the GNS construction of π_h.

Proof. (1) By the second parag of [Akem,2], $h = h_0 + g$ with $h_0 \in (1-z)\mathcal{A}^*$ and $zg \in z\mathcal{A}^*$. And every element of $\mathcal{A}^*$ can be uniquely decomposed as a sum of an element of $z\mathcal{A}^*$ and an element of $(1_0 - z)\mathcal{A}^*$.

By parag 2 of [Akem 2], for each $U, V \in \mathcal{A}$, $Vg \in z\mathcal{A}^*$ and $Uh_0 \in (1-z)\mathcal{A}$. Let $E = z\mathcal{B}^*$ and $F = \{Uh_0|_{\mathcal{B}} : U \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Then, $E, F \subseteq \mathcal{B}^*$. If $(Uh_0)|_{\mathcal{B}} = (U'h_0)|_{\mathcal{B}}$, then by Lemma 2.1 (in the proof of which we have made use of our decomposition of pure states), $Uh_0 = U'h_0$. By [Akem Lemma III.2,3] every element $g|_{\mathcal{B}}$ of E has a unique extension, which we repr as g. Define $J : E + F \to \mathcal{A}^*$ by

$$J\Big(Uh_0|_{\mathcal{B}} + g|_{\mathcal{B}}\Big) = Uh_0 + g,$$

J is well defined on F and it is well defined on E. So, J is well defined on $E + F$.

For any $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

(1) $\|\hat{A_0}\| = \|A_0\| = \sup \big\{|A_0(q)| : q \in E, \|q\| = 1\big\}$.

(2) $\|\hat{A_0}\| = \sup \big\{|A_0(q_1 + q_2)| : q_1 \in E, q_2 \in F, \|q_1 + q_2\| = 1\big\}$.

Let σ be the weakest topology on $(E+F)^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}^{**}$ with respect to which all the elements of $E+F$ are continuous. Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ be the unit ball of $\mathcal{B}$ and $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\|A_0\| = 1$.

Claim. $\hat{A}_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{B}_1}^{\sigma}$.

Proof. If not, there is an element $f \in (F+E)$ such that $f(B) \leq r < f(\hat{A}_0)$ $\forall B \in \mathcal{B}_1$. So, $\|f\| = \|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq r$. Hence, $r < f(\hat{A}_0) \leq \|f\| \cdot \|\hat{A}_0\| \leq r$. That is, $r < r$. This contradiction proves the Claim.

So there is a net (B_α) in $\mathcal{B}_1$ such that $(q_1+q_2)(B_\alpha) \to (q_1+q_2)(A_0)$ for each $q_1 \in E$ and each $q_2 \in F$.

Hence, for any $f \in (1-z)\mathcal{A}^*$ and any $g \in z\mathcal{A}^*$ there is a bounded net (B_α) in $\mathcal{B}$ such that $U(f+g)(B_\alpha) \to U(f+g)(A_0)$ $\forall U \in \mathcal{A}$. That is, for every element $h \in \mathcal{A}^*$, there is a bounded net (B_α) in $\mathcal{B}$ such that $Uh(B_\alpha) \to Uh(A_0)$ $\forall U \in \mathcal{A}$. So, $(U, B_\alpha) \to (U, A_0)$ $\forall U \in \mathcal{A}$. Since, $\mathcal{A}$ is dense in $H(h, \mathcal{A})$ and (B_α) is bounded, $(X, B_\alpha)_h \to (X, A_0)_h$ $\forall X \in H(h, \mathcal{A})$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Theorem III.7 of [Akem,3], which is a variant of a result of J. Glimm [18], states that if $\mathcal{B}$ separates pure states of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is dense in $H(h, \mathcal{A})$ for each w^*-limit point h of the pure states of $\mathcal{A}$, then $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}$. Now the SWT (Thm 2.1) follows from this result and our Lemma 2.2 $\square$

Section 3. A Solution to a Problem of Arveson

We will need to recall the following definitions from [Arv, 9,10,11]. (1) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*-algebra with unit. A linear subspace S of $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be an operator system if contains the unit of $\mathcal{A}$ and if it is self-adjoint, that is $A \in \mathcal{S}$ iff $A^* \in \mathcal{S}$. The C^*-algebra generated by $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted $C^*(\mathcal{S})$. (2) A ucp map $\phi : \mathcal{S} \to B(H)$ is said to have the unique extension property if (a) it has a unique extension $\tilde{\phi} : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ and (b) the extension is multiplicative. Note that (b) implies that $\tilde{\phi}$ is a representation. (3) A ucp map $\phi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ is said to have the unique extension property if the restriction $\phi|_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathcal{S} \to B(H)$ has the unique extension property. (4) A representation $\pi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ is said to be

a boundary representation if (a) it is an irreducible representation and (b) it has the unique extension property. (5) A state f of $C^*(\mathcal{S})$ is said to be an $\mathcal{S}$-boundary state if (a) it is a pure state (b) the irriducible representation π_f occurring in its GNS construction, $f(A) = (\pi(A)\xi, \xi)$ is a boundary representation. (6) Let $\phi_1 : S \to B(H)$ and $\phi_2 : S \to B(K)$ be two ucp maps. Then, ϕ_2 is said to dilate ϕ_1 if (a) $H \subseteq K$ and (b) $\phi_1(s) = P_H\phi_2(s)|_H$ $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$.
Our next theorem generalizes Theorem 8.2 of [Arv,5] and answers his question stated in the abstract.

Theorem 3.1. The Main Theorem of this Section. Let $f_0 : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a pure state. Then, there a pure state extension $f : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that the GNS representation $f(A) = (\pi_f(A)\xi, \xi)$, defined by f has the unique extension property. That is, f is a boundary representation.
Proof. We begin our proof as did Arveson. Suppose $g : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to \mathbb{C}$ is any state extension of f_0. Let $\pi_g : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ be the GNS repr. defined by g. By a result of Dritschel-McCullough [11], $\pi_g|_{\mathcal{S}}$ has a maximal dilation $\rho|_{\mathcal{S}} : \mathcal{S} \to B(K)$ for some Hilbert space $K \supseteq H$. By a result of Solel-Muhly [20], every maximal dilation has the unique extension property. Let $\rho : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(K)$ be any ucp extension of $\rho|_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then, ρ is the unique ucp extension and $\rho|_{\mathcal{S}}$ has the unique extension property. An (easy) remark of Arveson [5] says, ρ is a repr. We have $\pi_g(s) = P_H\rho(s)|_H$ $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$.
Upto this point our proof is exactly the same as that of Arveson and it differs from his proof at this point. He proceeds using disintegration theory and we use our method of decomcopsing a state and a repr. given Section 1.
Claim. First of all note that ρ can be assumed to be a cyclic repr.
Proof of the Claim. Since, $1 = I + L(g) \in H$, $1 \in K$. Let $K_0 = \mathrm{cl}\{\rho(A)1 : A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})\}$ be the invariant subspace for $\rho[C^*(\mathcal{S})]$ generated by 1. Then, $K_0^{\perp}$ is also invariant under $\rho[C^*(\mathcal{S})]$. Let $P_0 : K \to K_0$ be the orthogonal projection onto K_0. Let $\rho_0(A) = P_0\rho(A)P_0$ and $\rho_1(A) = P_0^{\perp}\rho(A)P_0^{\perp}$. Then, $\rho = \rho_0 \oplus \rho_1$ and each of ρ_0 and ρ_1 is ucp map. A Remark of Arveson [pg1078,5] says if a direct sum of ucp maps has the unique extension property, then

each of the component maps has the unique extension property. So, in the present case, in particular, ρ_0 has the unique extension property. Since, $H \subseteq K_0$ and K_0 is invariant for $\rho(C^*(\mathcal{S}))$, we have $\pi_g(s) = P_H\rho_0(s)|_H$. Hence, ρ_0 is a cyclic representation such that $\rho_0|_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a dilation of $\pi_g|_{\mathcal{S}}$ with the unique extension property. We can assume $K_0 = K$ and $\rho_0 = \rho$ without loss of generality.

Recall again that ρ is a repr. Let h be the state defined by $h(A) = (\rho(A)1, 1)$. Let $\rho_h : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H_h)$ be the GNS repr. of h. The first section gives a family of (a) $\{h_\sigma : \sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}\}$ of pure states and (b) $\{\rho_\sigma : \sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}\}$ a family if irred reprs, and a net (ϕ_{η_σ}) satisfying, equations I,II,$\cdots$,V. We have

$$\rho = \lim \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_a} t_\sigma \rho_\sigma \qquad \text{That is,} \qquad \rho(A) = \lim_{\eta_\alpha} \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \rho_\sigma(A),$$

$\forall A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$. In other words,

$$(\rho(A)B, C) = \lim_{\eta_\alpha} \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma (\rho_\sigma(A)B, C)$$

for all $A, B, C \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$ $B, C \in H_h, B, C \in H_{\sigma i}$. Recall that $\rho_\sigma : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H_\sigma)$ is an irred repr for each σ. Let $\phi_\sigma : \mathcal{S} \to B(H_\sigma)$ be any family of ucp maps such that $\phi_\sigma(s) = \rho_\sigma(s)$ $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $\phi_\sigma : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H_\sigma)$ be any ucp extension of $\phi_\sigma|_{\mathcal{S}}$. For each $A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$, define

$$\phi(A) = \lim \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \phi_\sigma(A).$$

(If the limit doesn't exist, take a subnet of (η_α) so that the limit exists for each $A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$ and rename the subnet as (η_α).) It is routine to check that $\phi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H_h)$ is a ucp map and

$$\phi(s) = \lim \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \phi_\sigma(s) = \lim \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma \rho_\sigma(s) = \rho(s).$$

for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$. By the hypothesis, ρ has the unique extension property. So, $\rho(A) = \phi(A)$ $\forall A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$. That is, $\rho = \phi$. Hence,

$\rho_\sigma = \phi_\sigma$ for each $\sigma \in \tilde{\sigma}$. That is, ρ_σ has the unique extension property. $\square$

Section 4. A Solution to a Conjecture of Arveson

In [Thm.2.1,9]Arveson proved that a separable operator system $\mathcal{S}$ is HR iff every repr $\pi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$, into a separable Hilbert space H, has the unique extension property, in the sense that if $\phi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ is any ucp such that $\pi|_\mathcal{S} = \phi|_\mathcal{S}$, then $\pi = \phi$. We will apply a version of this theorem for nonseparable operator systems. His [Def.1.1,9] of a separable HR operator system has to do with convergence of some sequences. Replacing sequences by nets leads to the definition of a general (not neccessarily saparable) HR operator system. Some obvious changes in his proof of [Thm.2.1,9] gives a proof of his result for nonseparable operator systems, that is the same statement as [Thm.2.1,9] with the word "separable" dropped.

Our next result proves his [Conjecture 4.3,9].

Theorem 4.1.The Main Theorem of this Section. An operator system $\mathcal{S}$ is hyperrigid iff every irreducible reprepresentation $\pi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$, for any Hilbert space H, has the unique extension property.

Proof. The version of [Thm.2.1,9] for nonseparable case covers one direction. For the other direction, suppose $\pi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ is any repr and $\phi : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H)$ is any ucp map with $\pi|_\mathcal{S} = \phi|_\mathcal{S}$. Using the hypothesis that every irred repr of $C^*(\mathcal{S})$ has the unique extension property, we will show that $\pi = \phi$. Then, we will apply the other direction of [Thm.2.1,9] to obtain the conclusion of the present theorem.

We leave it to the readers to verify that without loss of generality we can assume that π is a cyclic repr with cyclic vector 1.

Claim. $\phi(A) \in \overline{\pi(C^*(\mathcal{S}))}^{\text{thin}}$.

Proof. $\phi(A) \in B(H)$. Suppose $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \tilde{\sigma}$ are any two distinct elements. We have defined $R_\sigma \in B(H_\sigma)$ for any $R \in B(H)$. We wish to define $(\phi(A))_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} : (H_{\sigma_1} \oplus H_{\sigma_2}) \to (H_{\sigma_1} \oplus H_{\sigma_2})$. Define

$$\Big(\phi(A)\Big)_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} = \Big(Q_{\sigma_1} + Q_{\sigma_2}\Big)\phi(A)\Big(Q_{\sigma_1} + Q_{\sigma_2}\Big).$$

$$(\phi(\cdot))_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} : C^*(\mathcal{S}) \to B(H_{\sigma_1} \oplus H_{\sigma_2})$$

is a ucp map.
We have (1) $(\phi(s))_{\sigma_i} = \pi_{\sigma_i}(s)$ $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$. and $i = 1, 2$ and (2) $\phi(s)_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} = \pi(s)_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)}$, $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$. (1) is obvious. (2) needs verification and it can be done with not much difficulty. (1) and the hypothesis of the theorem, implies that $\forall A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$ and $\forall i = 1, 2$

$$\text{(III)} \qquad \phi(A)_{\sigma_i} = \pi(A)_{\sigma_i}.$$

Under this condition, Arveson [pg364,9], proved that

$$\text{(IV)} \qquad \Big(\phi(A)\Big)_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)} P_j = P_j\Big(\phi(A)\Big)_{\sigma_1\sigma_2},$$

where $P_i : H_{\sigma_1} \oplus H_{\sigma_2} \to H_{\sigma_i}$ are the ortho projections. It follows that $\phi(A) \in \overline{\pi(C^*(\mathcal{S}))}^{\text{thin}}$.
So, by Lemma 1.1 of Section 1, $\phi(A) = J_2J_1(\phi(A))$, where $J_1(\phi(A)) = ((\phi(A))_\sigma) \in \oplus B(H_\sigma)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(J_2((\phi(A)_\sigma)_\sigma B, C\Big)_h &= \lim \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma((\phi(A)_\sigma B, C)_\sigma \\ &= \lim \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma((P_\sigma\phi(A)P_\sigma B, C)_\sigma \\ &= \lim \sum_{\sigma\in\eta_\alpha} t_\sigma(\pi_\sigma(A)B, C)_{\sigma i} \\ &= (\pi(A)B, C)_h\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\phi(A) = \pi(A)$ for each $A \in C^*(\mathcal{S})$. This completes a proof of the theorem. □

References

1. Jim Agler, An Abstract approach to model theory. In Surveys of some recent results on operator theory, Vol II, pages 1-23. Harlow. 1988 Longman Sci Tech. MR976842 (90a:47016)

2. Akemann, C. A. Sequential convergence in the dual of a W*-algebra, Comm. Math. Phys. 7 (1968), 222-224.

3. Akemann, C. A.: The general Stone-Weierstrass problem, J. Func. Analysis 4(1969), 277-294.

4. Akemann, C. A.: Left ideal structures of C^*-algebras, J. Func. Analysis,6(1970), 305-317.

5. Akemann, C. A. and Anderson, J: The Stone-Weierstrass Problem for C^*-algebras. (1982), 15-32.

6. Anderson, J. and Bunce, J. W. : Approximating maps and Stone-Weierstrass theorem.

7. Anderson J. and Bunce, J. W.: Stone-Weierstrass theorems for separable C*-algebras, J. Operator Theory 6 (1981), no. 2, 363-374. MR 643697 (83b:46077)

8. C. Akemann and N. Weaver, Consistency of a counterexample to Naimark's problem, Proc. NAS (USA)101:7522-7525.

9. W. B. Arveson, The noncommutative Choquet boundary II: Hyperrigidity, Israel Jour. Math. 184 (2011) 349-385.
arXiv:OA/0810.4343.

10. W. B. Arveson, The noncommutative Choquet boundary, Journal of the American Mathematical Society. 21 (2008), 1065-1084. arXiv:OA/0701329v4.

11. W. B. Arveson, Subalgebras of C^*-algebras, Acta Math, 123, 141-224 (1969) MR0253059 (40:6274).

12. D. Blecher, The Shilov boundary of an operator space and the characterization theorems, J. Func. Anal. 182:280-343, 2001, MR1828796 (2002d:46049).

13. M.-D Choi, A Schwarz inequality for positive linear maps on C^*-algebras, Illnois Jour. Math. 18 (1974). 565-574.

14. J. Dixmier, Les algebres d'operateurs dans l'espacesHilbertien, Gauthier-Villars, Paris 1957, MP 2132691(2006a:47095).

15. Dritschel and McCullough, Boundary representations for families of representationsof operator algebras and spaces, Jour. Operator Theory.

16. Effros, E. G.: Order Ideals in a C^*-algebra and its dual.Duke Math J. 30, (1963), 391-412.

17. Effros, E. G.: Injectives and tensor products for convex sets and C^*-algebras, Lectures given at the NATO Institute on the "Facial structure of compact convex sets' at the University College of Swansea, Wales, July, 1972.

18. Glimm, J.: A Stone-Weierstrass theorem for C*-algebras, Ann. of Math. (2) 72 (1960), 216-244. MR 0116210

19. M. Hamana, Injective envelopes of C^*-algebras, Jour. of the mathematical Society of Japan, 31 (1979), 181-197.

20. Kadison, R.V. Irreducible operator algebras, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 43 (3) (1957), 273-276.

21. R. V. Kadison, A generalized Schwartz inequality and algebraic invariants for C^*-algebras, Ann. of Math. 56 (1952), 494-503.

22. Kaplansky, I.: The Structure of certain operator algebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 70 (1951), 219-255.

23. I. Kaplansky, A theorem on rings of operators, Vol. 1 (1951) 227-232.

24. Jun Ichi Fujii, Korovkin's Theorem and Strict Positivity, Math. Japonica 32 32, No. 1 (1987), 17-20.

25. C. Kleski, Boundary representations and completely positive maps. ArXiv1110.4149/OA (2011).

26. M. Krein, D. Milman (1940) On extreme points of regular convex sets, Studia Mathematica 9 133-138.

27. P. P. Korovkin, On convergence of linear positive operators in the space of continuous fnctions, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR (N.S.) 90 (1953), 961-964.

28. B. V. Limaye, M. N. N. Namboodiri, A generalized noncommutative Korovkin theorem and $*$-closedness of certain sets of convergence, Illinois Journal of Mathematics. Volume 28, Issue 2 (1984), 267-280.

29. Longo, R.: Solution of the factorial Stone-Weierstrass conjecture. An application of the theory of standard split W*-inclusions, Invent. Math. 76 (1984), no. 1, 145-155. MR 739630

30. Milman, D. (1947). "[Characteristics of extremal points of regularly convex sets]" (in Russian). Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR

57: 119-122.
31. P. Muhly and B. Solel, An algebraic characterization of boundary representations, In Nonselfajoint operator algebras, operator theory, and related topics, pages 189-196, Basel 1998 Burkhauser MR1639657 (99f:47057).
32. M. N. N. Namboodiri, Geometric theorey of weak Korovkin sets, Operators and Matrices, Vol. 6, No. 2, (2012), 271-278.
33. V. Paulsen, Completely bounded maps and operator algebras Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK, 2002, MR1976867. (2004c46118).
34. Pedersen, G. K.: C*-algebras and their automorphism groups, London Mathematical Society Monographs, vol. 14, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], London, 1979. MR 548006 (81e:46037)
35. Popa, S.: Semiregular maximal abelian *-subalgebras and the solution to the factor state Stone-Weierstrass problem, Invent. Math. 76 (1984), no. 1, 157-161. MR 739631.
36. Popa, S.: On a problem of R. V. Kadison, on maximal abelian *-subalgebras in factors, Invent. Math.65 (1981), 269-281.
37. W. M. Priestley A noncommutative Korovkin Theorem, J. Aprrox. theory, 16 (1976), 251-260.
38. S. Sakai, C^*-Algebras and W^*-algebras, Springer, (1971).
39. Sakai, S.: On the Stone-Weierstrass theorem of C^*-algebras. Source: Tohoku Math. J. (2) Volume 22, Number 2 (1970), 191-199.
40. Sakai, S. and Tsui, K. S.: Factor state extension on nuclear C*-algebras, Yokohama Math Jour. 29 1981 157-160.
41. Stone, M. H.: The generalized Weierstrass Approximation Theorem, Math Mag. 21 (1948), 167-184,, 237-254.
42. S.-E. Takehasi, Korovkin Theorems for C^*-algebras, Journal of Approximation theory, 27, 197-202 (1979).
43. Tomita, M.: Spectral theory of operator algebras, I math Jour of Okayama Univ. 9 (1959), 63-98.
44. Tsui, S. K.: Factor state extension on nuclear C*-algebras, Yokohama Math. J. 29 (1981), no. 2, 157-160.
45. Tsui, S. K.: Central sequences associated with a state, Proc.

Amer. Math. Soc. 82 (1981), no. 1, 76-80.